## JOHN A. PINDAR (1969) GEORGE W. CONNELL (2005) ADRIAN M. FOLEY, JR. GEORGE J. KENNY\* KENNETH F. KUNZMAN SAMUEL D. LORD (2012) RICHARD D. CATENACCI RICHARD J. BADOLATO\* PETER D. MANAHAN JOHN B. MURRAY MARK L. FLEDER KEVIN J. COAKLEY THOMAS S. COSMA KATHLEEN S. MURPHY PATRICK J. MCAULEY PETER J. PIZZI\*+ KEVIN R. GARDNER ROBERT E. RYAN MICHAEL X. MCBRIDE\* JEFFREY W. MORYAN EDWARD S. WARDELL PETER J. SMITH\* WILLIAM P. KRAUSS BRIAN G. STELLER PHILIP F. MCGOVERN, JR. KAREN PAINTER RANDALL LIZA M. WALSH JOHN P. LACEY MICHAEL J. CROWLEY-TIMOTHY E. CORRISTON\* PATRICK J. HUGHES\* JAMES C. MCCANN\* JOHN D. CROMIE

ANGELA A. IUSO\* WILLIAM T. MCGLOIN\* BRENDAN JUDGE STEPHEN A. URBAN CHARLES J. HARRINGTON III+ STEPHEN V. FALANGA\* TRICIA O'REILLY\* ANTHONY F. VITIELLO\* MARC D. HAEFNER JONATHAN P. MCHENRY BRAD D. SHALIT\* M. TREVOR LYONS\* CRAIG S. DEMARESKI\* W. NEVINS MCCANN\* THOMAS J. O'LEARY\* MITCHELL W. TARASCHI MICHAEL A. SHADIACK OWEN C. MCCARTHY\* PATRICIA A. LEE\* AGNIESZKA ANTONIAN\* MICHAEL MICELL CHRISTOPHER J. TUCCI+ NEIL V. MODY\* STEVE BARNETT\*
THOMAS M. SCUDERI\* JOSEPH M. MURPHY\* NANCY A. SKIDMORE\* CHRISTINE S. ORLANDO JENNIFER C. CRITCHLEY\* PATRICK S. BRANNIGAN\* CHRISTINE I. GANNON\* ANDREW C. SAYLES WILLIAM D. DEVEAU\*

\*Also Admitted in New York
+Also Admitted in Pennsylvania
-Only Admitted in New York
PLEASE REPLY TO ROSELAND, NJ

## CONNELL FOLEY LLP

85 LIVINGSTON AVENUE ROSELAND, NJ 07068-3702 (973) 535-0500 FAX: (973) 535-9217

## OTHER OFFICES

HARBORSIDE FINANCIAL CENTER 2510 PLAZA FIVE JERSEY CITY, NJ 07311 (201) 521-1000 FAX: (201) 521-0100

1500 MARKET STREET
12TH FLOOR,
EAST TOWER
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102
(215) 246-3403
FAX: (215) 665-5727

LIBERTY VIEW
457 HADDONFIELD
ROAD, SUITE 230
CHERRY HILL, NJ 08002
(856) 317-7100
FAX: (856) 317-7117

888 SEVENTH AVENUE

NEW YORK, NY 10106 (212) 307-3700

FAX: (212) 262-0050

THE ATRIUM, SUITE E 309 MORRIS AVENUE SPRING LAKE, NJ 07762 (732) 449-1440 FAX: (732)449-0934 COUNSEL

JOHN W. BISSELL EUGENE J. CODEY, JR. FRANCIS J. ORLANDO FRANCIS E. SCHILLER\* EUGENE P. SQUEO\* BRIAN P. MORRISSEY-NOEL D. HUMPHREYS\* ANTHONY ROMANO II\*

DOUGLAS J. SHORT\* JAMES M. MERENDINO MICHELE T. TANTALLA\* HECTOR D. RUIZ\* ROBERT A. VERDIBELLO\* PHILIP W. ALLOGRAMENTO III\* STEPHEN D. KESSLER CHRISTOPHER ABATEMARCO\* ANTHONY J. CORINO\* INGRID E. DA COSTA MEGHAN BARRETT BURKE\* RUKHSANAH L. SINGH\* BRITTANY E. MIANO\* STACIE L. POWERS\* NICOLE B. DORY\* MICHAEL BOJBASA-CHRISTOPHER M. HEMRICK\* SUSAN KWIATKOWSKI MELISSA D. LOPEZ ANDREW L. BARON JASON D. FALK MICHAEL J. SHORTT+ VICTORIA N. MANOUSHAGIAN'

PATRICK J. MURPHY, III\*

KARIN I. SPALDING\*
JODI ANNE HUDSON\*
RICHARD A. JAGEN
JASON E. MARX\*
ALEXIS E. LAZZARA
GAIL GOLDFARB
THOMAS VECCHIO+
DANIEL B. KESSLER\*

MEGHAN K. MUSSO\* BRENDAN W. CARROLL\* ELEONORE OFOSU-ANTWI\* EDMUND J. CAULFIELD SYDNEY J. DARLING\* JESSICA L. PALMER\* NEIL V. SHAH\* STEPHEN R. TURANO\* STEVEN A. KROLL\* ROBERT M. DIPISA\* MATTHEW A. BAKER+ MICHAEL J. CREEGAN\* THOMAS M. BLEWITT, JR.+ BRIAN S. WOLFSON MARY F. HURLEY DANIELLE M. NOVAK+ KATELYN O'REILLY JAMES E. FIGLIOZZI-MATTHEW D. FIELDING\* MELISSA L. HIRSCH+ MARIEL L. BELANGER\* NICHOLAS W. URCIUOLI KERRY C. DONOVAN GENEVIEVE L. HORVATH

April 30, 2013

## VIA ECF

Honorable Esther Salas, U.S.D.J. United States District Court for the District of New Jersey Martin Luther King Jr. Bldg. &U.S. Courthouse 50 Walnut Street Newark, New Jersey 07101

Re: Roche Palo Alto LLC et al. v. Lupin Pharm., Inc. et al. Civil Action No. 2:10-3561 (ES/SCM)

Dear Judge Salas:

We write pursuant to Your Honor's instructions today regarding certain objections that were raised during the trial. In his non-infringement report, Dr. Mayersohn gave no opinion that Dr. Weiner's methodology is "generally unacceptable." Instead, he had specific critiques about accumulation ratios and nonlinearity ratios. (*See* Mayersohn Report at ¶¶8 and 13.) Dr. Mayersohn also provided none of the statistics or data about MARISA contained in Lupin's demonstratives. A different Lupin expert, Dr. Kay, supplied statistical data, primarily in connection with validity. Dr. Mayersohn neither relied on Dr. Kay nor had any contact with him. Accordingly, Dr. Mayersohn's proposed opinions on these issues – reflected on Slides DDX-29 and 30 and the titles of Slides DDX-31-34—should not be allowed.

In Court, Lupin represented that paragraph 8 of Dr. Mayersohn's Responsive Report contains the opinion that Dr. Weiner's methodology was not generally accepted. It does not. Rather, Dr. Mayesohn opined that it was not appropriate for Dr. Weiner to calculate 2 accumulation ratios for each subject (one for Cmax and one for Ctrough), contending that each subject should only have 1 accumulation ratio. Because Dr. Weiner convincingly refuted that

Honorable Esther Salas, U.S.D.J. April 30, 2013 Page 2

opinion in his reply report, Lupin now seeks to offer different opinions from Dr. Mayersohn as to why Dr. Weiner's methodology is not "generally acceptable."

Lupin's lawyers attempt to excuse this new opinion by saying they had no notice before Friday that Dr. Weiner's approach had been accepted by a court in another case, specifically Allergan. First, that does not matter because Dr. Weiner laid out his methodology and if Dr. Mayersohn thought it was generally unacceptable, he should have laid this out in his report. In any event, Lupin cannot be surprised by that fact because Dr. Weiner told them this at his deposition (Dep. 80:17-81:2.) In addition, Dr. Mayersohn himself was the opposing generic's expert in the Allergan case.

Counsel for plaintiffs note that all this results from trial testimony from Dr. Weiner that drew not a single objection that it was outside the scope of his report or new.

As for the statistics and specific data regarding the MARISA study, these are nowhere in Dr. Mayersohn's report. Rather, Dr. Mayersohn in his report states "I understand from counsel that another expert has reviewed the MARISA data . . . I understand that further analysis concerning the relative validity of the MARISA and CVT 3015 data is provided by another Lupin expert." (Mayersohn Report ¶45-46). And Dr. Mayersohn told us in his deposition that he has never spoken with any other expert in this case or read their reports. (Mayersohn 109:20-111:3.) Lupin attempts to excuse these new opinions by telling the Court that they did not have this data at the time Dr. Mayersohn wrote his responsive report. This also, is not the case. The data was provided in Dr. Weiner's Opening Report in Appendix 2 (now PTX-675). And not surprising, Dr. Kay in his responding report conduct statistical analysis on this very data.

While plaintiffs would rather not have to make such objections and slow down the trial, Lupin's attorneys are attempting to present new opinions from Dr. Mayersohn not previously disclosed.

We appreciate the Court's continued attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Liza M. Walsh

Liza M. Walsh

cc: All Counsel of Record (via ECF and email)